

The anomalous shift of the weak boson mass and the quintessence electroweak axion

Weikang Lin,^{1,*} Tsutomu T. Yanagida,^{1,2,†} and Norimi Yokozaki^{3,‡}

¹*Tsung-Dao Lee Institute (TDLI) & School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shengrong Road 520, 201210 Shanghai, P. R. China*

²*Kavli IPMU (WPI), The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8583, Japan*

³*Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics and Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310027, China*

(Dated: January 18, 2023)

One of the simplest ways to account for the observed W-boson mass shift is to introduce the $SU(2)_L$ triplet Higgs boson with zero hypercharge, whose vacuum expectation value is about 3 GeV. If the triplet is heavy enough at $\mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, it essentially contributes only to T parameter without any conflict to the observation. The presence of a complex triplet Higgs boson raises the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling constant to $\alpha_2(M_{\text{PL}}) \simeq 1/44$ at the Planck scale. Thanks to this larger gauge coupling constant, we show that the electroweak axion vacuum energy explains the observed cosmological constant provided that the axion field is located near the hill top of the potential at present.

I. THE W BOSON MASS SHIFT AND THE WEAK $SU(2)$ GAUGE COUPLING CONSTANT

The CDF collaboration recently reported an updated precise measurement of the W-boson mass [1], which is significantly larger than the Standard Model (SM) prediction and the world average without this new CDF result [2]. With this new CDF result, the experimental average of the W-boson mass becomes [3]

$$(M_W)_{\text{exp}} = (80.4133 \pm 0.0080) \text{ GeV}, \quad (1)$$

which deviates from the SM prediction [3] by 6.5σ :

$$(M_W)_{\text{SM}} = (80.3499 \pm 0.0056) \text{ GeV}. \quad (2)$$

The discrepancy, $\delta M_W \equiv (M_W)_{\text{exp}} - (M_W)_{\text{SM}} \sim 60 \text{ MeV}$ is easily explained by the small vacuum expectation value (VEV) of a $SU(2)_L$ triplet Higgs boson with zero hypercharge [4–8], which only contributes to the W^\pm mass at the tree-level [9–15]. The mass shift of the W-boson may suggest the existence of the triplet Higgs boson at the TeV scale.

Let us discuss the W-boson mass shift, $\delta M_W \sim 60 \text{ MeV}$, with the complex $SU(2)_L$ triplet Higgs boson, Σ , added to the SM Higgs potential. We consider the following potential:

$$V \ni -m_H^2 |H|^2 + \lambda_H |H|^4 + 2m_\Sigma^2 \text{Tr} \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma + (A_H H^\dagger \Sigma H + h.c.) + V_4, \quad (3)$$

where we write

$$\Sigma = \Sigma^a T^a = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^3 & \sqrt{2} X_1^+ \\ \sqrt{2} X_2^- & -\Sigma^3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Here, T^a is a generator of $SU(2)_L$, which satisfies $\text{Tr}(T^a T^b) = 1/2 \delta^{ab}$; we assume only $H^\dagger \Sigma H$ term violates a global $U(1)$ symmetry, $\Sigma \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \Sigma$; we consider the case where $m_\Sigma^2 > 0$ and m_Σ^2 is much larger than the squared of the weak scale; V_4 contains the quartic terms, $\text{Tr}(\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma)^2$, $\text{Tr}(\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma^\dagger) \text{Tr}(\Sigma \Sigma)$, $\text{Tr}(\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma)$, $\text{Tr}(\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma \Sigma)$.¹ However, these terms are not important in our case. By putting $\langle H \rangle = (0, v)^T$, the potential for Σ^3 near the origin is dominated by the (effective) linear term and the quadratic term, $-(A_H v^2 \Sigma^3/2 + h.c.) + m_\Sigma^2 |\Sigma^3|^2$. The quartic terms become important only for $\Sigma^3 \sim m_\Sigma$, which is irrelevant in our case. From these facts, we neglect V_4 in the following discussions.

By minimizing the potential in Eq. (3), the vacuum expectation values for the doublet and triplet Higgs are

$$v^2 = (m_H^2 + A_H v_T)/(2\lambda_H), \quad v_T = \frac{A_H v^2}{2m_\Sigma^2}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\langle H \rangle = (0, v)^T, \quad \langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} v_T & 0 \\ 0 & -v_T \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

At the tree-level, the W-boson mass with the triplet Higgs is expressed as (see e.g., [16])

$$M_W \approx (M_W)_{\text{SM}} \left[1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\cos^2 \theta_W}{\cos^2 \theta_W - \sin^2 \theta_W} (\alpha T_{\text{tree}}) \right], \quad (7)$$

where θ_W is the weak mixing angle, α is the fine structure constant and T_{tree} is the T -parameter at the tree-level:

$$T_{\text{tree}} = \frac{4v_T^2}{v^2} \frac{1}{\alpha}. \quad (8)$$

As shown in Refs. [3, 4] (see also [17]), $T \sim 0.15, S = 0$ can explain δM_W . It corresponds to $v_T \sim 3 \text{ GeV}$ in our

* weikanglin@sjtu.edu.cn

† tsutomu.tyanagida@sjtu.edu.cn

‡ n.yokozaki@gmail.com

¹ Here, we assume V_4 respects a $U(1)$ symmetry: $\Sigma \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \Sigma$.

case. The loop effects to the oblique parameters, S and T , are suppressed as $\sim k^2/16\pi^2(M_W^2/m_\Sigma^2)$ (k is a relevant coupling), which are negligible for $m_\Sigma \geq 1$ TeV. For the U parameter, since it comes from a dimension eight operator, the effect is even more suppressed. So far, only $T \simeq T_{\text{tree}}$ is non-negligible.




FIG. 1. Renormalization group evolution of gauge coupling constants in SM (dotted), SM + one real triplet Higgs (dashed) and SM + one complex triplet Higgs (solid). The blue, green and orange lines show $U(1)_Y$, $SU(2)_L$ and $SU(3)_C$ couplings, respectively. (Here, $\alpha_i^{-1} = 4\pi/g_i^2$). The mass of the triplet Higgs is taken as 1 TeV. The bottom plot is the zoomed one of the top plot.

The mixing between the SM Higgs and the triplet Higgs comes from the scalar trilinear coupling in Eq.(3). The trilinear coupling A_H is related to m_Σ as

$$\frac{A_H}{m_\Sigma} = \frac{2v_T m_\Sigma}{v^2} \approx 0.3 \left(\frac{m_\Sigma}{1500 \text{ GeV}} \right) \left(\frac{v_T}{3 \text{ GeV}} \right). \quad (9)$$

The ratio, A_H/m_Σ , increases linearly with m_Σ . This relation is almost unchanged even if quartic couplings involving Σ are included (unless $m_\Sigma^2 < 0$). The CP-even Higgs bosons in H and Σ^3 are mixed due to the third

term in Eq. (3):

$$\begin{pmatrix} h \\ \sigma_H \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_{\text{mix}} & \sin \theta_{\text{mix}} \\ -\sin \theta_{\text{mix}} & \cos \theta_{\text{mix}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_0 \\ \sigma_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma_0/\sqrt{2} \in H$ and $\sigma_3/\sqrt{2} \in \Sigma^3$; h and σ_H are the mass eigenstates: they correspond to the SM-like Higgs and the CP-even heavy Higgs, respectively. The masses of these Higgs bosons are [8]²

$$\begin{aligned} m_h^2 &\simeq 4\lambda_H v^2 - \frac{A_H^2 v^2}{m_\Sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(v^4) \\ m_{\sigma_H}^2 &\simeq m_\Sigma^2 + \frac{A_H^2 v^2}{m_\Sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(v^4). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The mixing angle, θ_{mix} , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tan 2\theta_{\text{mix}} &= \frac{2A_H v}{m_\Sigma^2 - 4\lambda_H v^2} \\ &\approx \frac{2A_H}{m_\Sigma} \frac{v}{m_\Sigma} \approx 0.07 \left(\frac{v_T}{3 \text{ GeV}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The mixing angle is almost fixed by the VEV of the triplet as long as $m_\Sigma \gg v$, with $\theta_{\text{mix}} \approx 0.035$. Therefore, the SM-like CP-even Higgs couplings are modified by a fixed amount ($\theta_{\text{mix}}^2/2 \approx 0.06\%$) compared to those of the SM Higgs in the heavy triplet region, which is a kind of general prediction.

On the other hand, when $A_H/m_\Sigma \gtrsim 1$, it induces a deeper global minimum other than the electroweak symmetry breaking minimum even if we include quartic couplings containing Σ .³ We expect the vacuum stability puts the upper-bound on m_Σ , which is not much larger than 5 TeV.

The presence of the complex $SU(2)_L$ triplet with the zero hypercharge at the TeV scale changes the renormalization group evolution of the gauge coupling constants. In particular, this triplet Higgs only affects the renormalization group equation (RGE) for the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling at the one-loop level:

$$\frac{d\alpha_2^{-1}}{d \ln Q_r} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \left(b_{\text{SM}} + \frac{2}{3} \right), \quad (13)$$

where Q_r is the renormalization scale and $b_{\text{SM}} = -19/6$. In Fig. 1, the RG evolution of the gauge coupling constants at the two-loop level are shown. We use PyR@TE 3 [18] to obtain the two-loop RGEs. Interestingly, as shown in Ref. [8] and Fig. 1, the complex $SU(2)_L$ triplet with the mass of ~ 1 TeV leads to rather precise gauge coupling unification. This suggests us to consider a grand unified theory (GUT) at the scale around 10^{14} GeV. It has been shown that $SU(5)$ GUT can successfully be constructed without inducing rapid proton decays [8].

² For the other Higgs bosons, see Ref. [8].

³ For instance, one can consider the direction $\langle \sigma_0 \rangle = \langle \sigma_3 \rangle = x$ ($\sigma_0 \in H, \sigma_3 \in \Sigma^3$) in the scalar potential. Then, the potential can be written as $V_{\text{eff}} \simeq m_\Sigma^2 x^2 - 2A_3 x^3 + l_{\text{eff}} x^4$, which has the deeper global minimum for $A_3^2 H/l_{\text{eff}} > (8/9)m_\Sigma^2$.

II. THE QUINTESSENCE ELECTROWEAK AXION DARK ENERGY

Now what if there were no GUT? Surprisingly, in this case, the observed dark energy may be explained by the potential of the electroweak (EW) axion [19].⁴ It was pointed out that the $SU(2)_L$ instantons give a correct magnitude of the observed dark energy in the supersymmetric (SUSY) standard model [23].

First, let us discuss a short summary of the SUSY EW axion. We assume that a massless Nambu-Goldstone boson (i.e. EW axion), A , couples to the $SU(2)_L$ gauge field as

$$\frac{g_2^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{A}{F_A} W_{\mu\nu}^i \widetilde{W}^{i\mu\nu}, \quad (14)$$

where F_A is the decay constant of the Nambu-Goldstone boson (which is determined by an ultraviolet theory). Integrating out the $SU(2)_L$ instantons, we obtain the following EW axion potential where \mathbf{W} and $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ are the electroweak gauge field and its dual [23]

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_A^4 (1 - \cos(A/F_A)), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\Lambda_A^4 = 2c \times \epsilon^{10} m_{3/2}^3 M_{\text{PL}} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_2(M_{\text{PL}})}}. \quad (16)$$

Here, c is an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant, $\epsilon \simeq 1/17$ [24] the flavor suppression factor due to the Froggatt-Nielsen symmetry [25] and $\alpha_2(M_{\text{PL}}) \simeq 1/23$ the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling constant at the Planck scale $M_{\text{PL}} \simeq 2.4 \times 10^{18}$ GeV. We reproduce the observed dark energy at around the hill top of the EW axion potential, that is [2, 26]

$$\Lambda_{\text{obs}}^4 \approx 7 \times 10^{-121} M_{\text{PL}}^4, \quad (17)$$

for $c \simeq 1$ and the gravitino mass $m_{3/2} \simeq 1.8$ TeV.

However, in the non-SUSY SM, the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling constant is smaller as $\alpha_2(M_{\text{PL}}) \simeq 1/48$, and hence the potential energy of the EW axion becomes too small. This can be partially remedied by removing the flavor suppression factor ϵ^{10} . For instance, a model with a discrete Z_{10} Froggatt-Nielsen symmetry can generate the axion potential without the flavor suppression factor [27]. This Z_{10} Froggatt-Nielsen symmetry is anomaly free and may originate from a gauge symmetry [27]. Alternatively, we can simply consider cases without the flavor symmetry in the non SUSY standard model. Then, the maximal potential energy is given by [28]

$$\Lambda_A^4 = c' \times M_{\text{PL}}^4 e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_2(M_{\text{PL}})}}, \quad (18)$$

⁴ A proposal to identify the quintessence for the dark energy with a pseudo Nambu-Goldstone boson (axion) is first discussed in [19], [20], [21] and [22].

which still gives the **ten** orders of magnitude smaller than the observed dark energy in Eq. (17).⁵

Now we return to the case of SM + one complex $SU(2)_L$ triplet Higgs. From Eq. (13), it is clear that $\alpha_2^{-1}(M_{\text{PL}})$ becomes larger than that in SM. The shift is estimated as $-1/(3\pi) \ln(M_{\text{PL}}/1\text{TeV}) \approx -3.8$, which gives $\exp(2\pi(3.8)) \approx 2.3 \times 10^{10}$. Therefore, the potential energy of the EW axion explains the observation Eq. (17) at $A \simeq \pi F_A$.

III. DISCUSSION

In all of the above discussions on the potential energy of the EW axion, we have assumed that the vacuum energy of the true potential minimum vanishes. This is at least consistent with the de-Sitter conjecture on the quantum breaking of the classical gravity [30] or on the string swampland [31], or our EW axion dark energy hypothesis is consistent with the anthropic principle [32].⁶ But if we want to understand the vanishing cosmological constant dynamically, we need some deeper insight of quantum gravity which is beyond the scope of this paper.⁷

However, even if the quintessence axion hypothesis is interesting, we have two serious problems. One is the quality problem of the shift symmetry as quantum gravity is believed to explicitly break any global symmetries. The other is the fine tuning problem of the initial axion field value. Namely, we have to assume that the initial value of the EW axion A_i is taken near the hill top of the potential, that is, $A_i \simeq \pi F_A$. The initial condition would not be a serious problem if $F_A \simeq M_{\text{PL}}$. However, if it is the case, the axion quality problem becomes very serious. We describe such a conflict in a more quantitative way as follows.

As for the breaking of the shift symmetry, we have probably many processes in quantum gravity. Let us dis-

⁵ It is pointed out that we can explain the observed vacuum energy if we adopt a larger cut-off scale than the Planck scale M_{PL} and c' a larger than $\mathcal{O}(1)$ [29].

⁶ The dark energy at the present universe may consist of two components unless the axion sits at its potential minimum already. One is truly the cosmological constant and the other the potential energy of the EW axion. The total dark energy is then constrained by the anthropic principle [32]. If both terms are comparable and the cosmological constant is positive, we do not have a severe fine-tuning problem discussed below even if the decay constant is $F_A \simeq 10^{16}$ GeV for a good quality of the EW axion. And the cosmic birefringence can be naturally explained by the movement of the EW axion. However, this positive cosmological constant is inconsistent with the de-Sitter conjecture. For the model to be consistent with the de-Sitter conjecture we must consider the cosmological constant to be the vacuum energy of some other light field B .

⁷ If there is some symmetry acting on the wave function of the universe, like the chiral symmetry acting on massless fermionic fields in quantum field theory, it might be possible to impose the cosmological constant to vanish.

cuss wormhole instanton effects here, since it can be estimated in a relatively straightforward way by solving wormhole-axion solutions [33]. The detailed calculation is given in [34] in which the relevant Euclidean action of the wormhole is given by

$$S_{wh} \simeq 0.14 \times \sqrt{8\pi} \frac{M_{\text{PL}}}{F_A}. \quad (19)$$

Imposing a sufficiently small suppression, i.e., $\exp(-S_{wh}) < 10^{-120}$, we obtain a constraint on $F_A < 0.7 \times 10^{16}$ GeV.

However, we consider that the above result is speculative due to the absence of the detailed knowledge of a quantum gravity. Maybe we have some non-perturbative contributions γ [33] to the wormhole action S_{wh} which may make the total wormhole action larger as long as no cancellations in different contributions take place. Thus, we consider the decay constant $F_A \simeq 10^{16}$ GeV is sufficiently small to suppress the explicit breaking of the axion shift symmetry by the wormholes.⁸

On the other hand, in order to keep the equation of state of the axion to be within the observational bound, i.e., $|w + 1| < 0.05$ [26], the initial A_I needs to be extremely close to the hill top of the potential. From a WKB approximation to the dynamics of the EW axion (and combining Eq. (10) in [36]), one can show that

$$\left| \frac{A_I}{F_A} - \pi \right| \leq \frac{M_{\text{PL}}}{F_A} e^{-\mathcal{O}(M_{\text{PL}}/F_A)}. \quad (20)$$

The above is $\sim 10^{-4}$ for $F_A \simeq 2 \times 10^{17}$ GeV but is $\sim 10^{-100}$ for $F_A \simeq 10^{16}$ GeV. Thus, an F_A that is sufficiently small to keep a good quality of the EW axion will need an extreme fine-tuning of the initial condition if the EW axion is the dark energy.

To avoid the above severe conflict between the EW axion quality and the naturalness of the initial condition, one can either (1) invoke some mechanism to suppress the wormhole effects for the shift symmetry breaking; (2) study some ways to alleviate or eliminate the fine tuning of the initial condition; or (3) assume the dark energy has some other origin and allow the EW axion to be a fraction of dark matter.

A solution achieving the above (1) may be given in higher dimensional space-time where the extra dimensions are compactified. In this case, the above wormhole solution in the four dimensional Euclidean space does not exist above the compactification scale Λ_{com} . We should take into account a momentum cut-off at the compactification scale $1/\Lambda_{\text{com}}$ in the estimation of Eq. (19), which would lead to a large wormhole Euclidean action [33]

$$S_{wh} \simeq \frac{3\pi^2}{8} \frac{M_{\text{PL}}^2}{\Lambda_{\text{com}}^2}. \quad (21)$$

⁸ For a recent discussion on the quality problem of axions in a linear σ model see [35].

Provided that $F_A \simeq \Lambda_{\text{com}}$ we obtain $F_A \leq 2.6 \times 10^{17}$ GeV to have a good quality for the quintessence EW axion. Although we can not estimate the shift-symmetry breaking effect above the compactification scale, we consider $F_A \simeq 2.6 \times 10^{17}$ GeV is sufficiently small to protect the quintessence axion quality. In this case, the degree of the fine-tuning of the initial condition becomes much milder, i.e., $|A_I/F_A - \pi| \leq 10^{-3}$. Additionally, with $F_A \simeq 2.6 \times 10^{17}$ GeV we can explain the cosmic birefringence if the EW axion is rolling now [36].

Another viable way is to consider two axions, both of which couple to the strong $SU(3)_C$ and weak $SU(2)_L$ gauge fields [37]. We consider the following Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \supset & \frac{g_2^2}{32\pi^2} \left(m_1 \frac{A_1}{F_1} + m_2 \frac{A_2}{F_2} \right) W_{\mu\nu}^i \widetilde{W}^{i\mu\nu} \\ & + \frac{g_3^2}{32\pi^2} \left(n_1 \frac{A_1}{F_1} + n_2 \frac{A_2}{F_2} \right) G_{\mu\nu}^a \widetilde{G}^{a\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $m_{1,2}$ and $n_{1,2}$ are anomaly coefficients, and \mathbf{G} is a gluon field. It is assumed that $F_1 \sim F_2 \sim 10^{16}$ GeV to allow good qualities for both axions. Assuming $m_1 n_2 - n_1 m_2 \neq 0$, in the following basis,

$$\begin{pmatrix} A \\ A' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

where $\tan \beta = \frac{n_1 F_2}{n_2 F_1}$, only A' couples to $\mathbf{G}\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ and obtains a large mass through the QCD non-perturbative effects. (A' is nothing but the QCD axion, solving the strong CP problem.) Due to the large mass, A' is quickly stabilized to the minimum and can be ignored. The other orthogonal component A remains massless with the following effective potential⁹

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{g_2^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{A}{F_{\text{eff}}} W_{\mu\nu}^i \widetilde{W}^{i\mu\nu}, \quad (24)$$

with

$$F_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\sqrt{n_1^2 F_2^2 + n_2^2 F_1^2}}{|m_1 n_2 - m_2 n_1|}. \quad (25)$$

Then, A only couples to $\mathbf{W}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ and can be identified as our EW axion. A larger effective decay constant $F_A = F_{\text{eff}} \sim 2 \times 10^{17}$ GeV can be obtained with $n_{1,2} \sim 10$ but a small $m_1 n_2 - m_2 n_1$ (e.g., $m_1 = m_2 = 1$, $n_2 = 10$ and $n_1 = 9$) for instance.

For possibility (3), the EW axion can start from a general point between 0 and πF_A . Then, the oscillation of the EW axion after $H \sim m_A$ makes it become a small fraction of dark matter. In fact, it is encouraging that we can naturally explain the observed cosmic birefringence [38–40] by the axion dark matter oscillation [41].¹⁰

⁹ We omit the sign.

¹⁰ This is also discussed in [42, 43]. However, they assume $F_A = M_{\text{PL}}$ and the obtained parameter space is different from that in [41]. Furthermore, they may have a serious axion quality problem with such a large F_A .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

T. T. Y. deeply thanks Li Fu for her helpful suggestions and encouragement and he is supported in part by the China Grant for Talent Scientific Start-Up Project

and by Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under grant No. 12175134 as well as by World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI Initiative), MEXT, Japan. N. Y. is supported by a start-up grant from Zhejiang University.

-
- [1] CDF Collaboration, T. Aaltonen *et al.*, “High-precision measurement of the W boson mass with the CDF II detector,” *Science* **376** no. 6589, (2022) 170–176.
 - [2] Particle Data Group Collaboration, R. L. Workman and Others, “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
 - [3] J. de Blas, M. Pierini, L. Reina, and L. Silvestrini, “Impact of the recent measurements of the top-quark and W-boson masses on electroweak precision fits,” [arXiv:2204.04204 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [4] A. Strumia, “Interpreting electroweak precision data including the W-mass CDF anomaly,” *JHEP* **08** (2022) 248, [arXiv:2204.04191 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [5] L. Di Luzio, R. Gröber, and P. Paradisi, “Higgs physics confronts the M_W anomaly,” *Phys. Lett. B* **832** (2022) 137250, [arXiv:2204.05284 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [6] P. Athron, M. Bach, D. H. J. Jacob, W. Kotlarski, D. Stöckinger, and A. Voigt, “Precise calculation of the W boson pole mass beyond the Standard Model with FlexibleSUSY,” [arXiv:2204.05285 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [7] P. Fileviez Perez, H. H. Patel, and A. D. Plascencia, “On the W mass and new Higgs bosons,” *Phys. Lett. B* **833** (2022) 137371, [arXiv:2204.07144 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [8] J. L. Evans, T. T. Yanagida, and N. Yokozaki, “W boson mass anomaly and grand unification,” *Phys. Lett. B* **833** (2022) 137306, [arXiv:2205.03877 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [9] D. A. Ross and M. J. G. Veltman, “Neutral Currents in Neutrino Experiments,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **95** (1975) 135–147.
 - [10] J. F. Gunion, R. Vega, and J. Wudka, “Higgs triplets in the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **42** (1990) 1673–1691.
 - [11] T. Blank and W. Hollik, “Precision observables in SU(2) x U(1) models with an additional Higgs triplet,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **514** (1998) 113–134, [arXiv:hep-ph/9703392](#).
 - [12] J. R. Forshaw, A. Sabio Vera, and B. E. White, “Mass bounds in a model with a triplet Higgs,” *JHEP* **06** (2003) 059, [arXiv:hep-ph/0302256](#).
 - [13] M.-C. Chen, S. Dawson, and T. Krupovnickas, “Higgs triplets and limits from precision measurements,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 035001, [arXiv:hep-ph/0604102](#).
 - [14] P. H. Chankowski, S. Pokorski, and J. Wagner, “(Non)decoupling of the Higgs triplet effects,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **50** (2007) 919–933, [arXiv:hep-ph/0605302](#).
 - [15] R. S. Chivukula, N. D. Christensen, and E. H. Simmons, “Low-energy effective theory, unitarity, and non-decoupling behavior in a model with heavy Higgs-triplet fields,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 035001, [arXiv:0712.0546 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [16] P. Diessner and G. Weiglein, “Precise prediction for the W boson mass in the MRSSM,” *JHEP* **07** (2019) 011, [arXiv:1904.03634 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [17] C.-T. Lu, L. Wu, Y. Wu, and B. Zhu, “Electroweak precision fit and new physics in light of the W boson mass,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 3, (2022) 035034, [arXiv:2204.03796 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [18] L. Sartore and I. Schienbein, “PyR@TE 3,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **261** (2021) 107819, [arXiv:2007.12700 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [19] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, “Model for the cosmological constant,” *Report number: YITP-K-1098* (1994).
 - [20] J. A. Frieman, C. T. Hill, A. Stebbins, and I. Waga, “Cosmology with ultralight pseudo Nambu-Goldstone bosons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 2077–2080, [arXiv:astro-ph/9505060](#).
 - [21] S. M. Carroll, “Quintessence and the rest of the world,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 3067–3070, [arXiv:astro-ph/9806099](#).
 - [22] K. Choi, “String or M theory axion as a quintessence,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 043509, [arXiv:hep-ph/9902292](#).
 - [23] Y. Nomura, T. Watari, and T. Yanagida, “Quintessence axion potential induced by electroweak instanton effects,” *Phys. Lett. B* **484** (2000) 103–111, [arXiv:hep-ph/0004182](#).
 - [24] W. Buchmüller and T. Yanagida, “Quark lepton mass hierarchies and the baryon asymmetry,” *Phys. Lett. B* **445** (1999) 399–402, [arXiv:hep-ph/9810308](#).
 - [25] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, “Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 277–298.
 - [26] Planck Collaboration, N. Aghanim *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6, [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#). [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
 - [27] G. Choi, M. Suzuki, and T. T. Yanagida, “Quintessence axion dark energy and a solution to the hubble tension,” *Phys. Lett. B* **805** (2020) 135408, [arXiv:1910.00459 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [28] M. Ibe, M. Yamazaki, and T. T. Yanagida, “Quintessence Axion Revisited in Light of Swampland Conjectures,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **36** no. 23, (2019) 235020, [arXiv:1811.04664 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [29] L. McLerran, R. Pisarski, and V. Skokov, “Electroweak Instantons, Axions, and the Cosmological Constant,” *Phys. Lett. B* **713** (2012) 301–303, [arXiv:1204.2533 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [30] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, “Quantum Exclusion of Positive Cosmological Constant?,” *Annalen Phys.* **528** (2016) 68–73, [arXiv:1412.8077 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [31] C. Vafa, “The String landscape and the swampland,” [arXiv:hep-th/0509212](#).
 - [32] S. Weinberg, “The Cosmological constant problems,” in *4th International Symposium on Sources and Detection of Dark Matter in the Universe (DM 2000)*, pp. 18–26. 2, 2000. [arXiv:astro-ph/0005265](#).
 - [33] S. B. Giddings and A. Strominger, “Axion Induced

- Topology Change in Quantum Gravity and String Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **306** (1988) 890–907.
- [34] R. Alonso and A. Urbano, “Wormholes and masses for Goldstone bosons,” *JHEP* **02** (2019) 136, [arXiv:1706.07415 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [35] G. Choi and T. T. Yanagida, “High Quality Axion in Supersymmetric Models,” [arXiv:2209.09290 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [36] G. Choi, W. Lin, L. Visinelli, and T. T. Yanagida, “Cosmic birefringence and electroweak axion dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 10, (2021) L101302, [arXiv:2106.12602 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [37] J. E. Kim, H. P. Nilles, and M. Peloso, “Completing natural inflation,” *JCAP* **01** (2005) 005, [arXiv:hep-ph/0409138](#).
 - [38] Y. Minami and E. Komatsu, “New Extraction of the Cosmic Birefringence from the Planck 2018 Polarization Data,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** no. 22, (2020) 221301, [arXiv:2011.11254 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [39] P. Diego-Palazuelos *et al.*, “Cosmic Birefringence from the Planck Data Release 4,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** no. 9, (2022) 091302, [arXiv:2201.07682 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [40] J. R. Eskilt and E. Komatsu, “Improved Constraints on Cosmic Birefringence from the WMAP and Planck Cosmic Microwave Background Polarization Data,” [arXiv:2205.13962 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [41] W. Lin and T. T. Yanagida, “Consistency of the string inspired electroweak axion with cosmic birefringence,” [arXiv:2208.06843 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [42] T. Fujita, K. Murai, H. Nakatsuka, and S. Tsujikawa, “Detection of isotropic cosmic birefringence and its implications for axionlike particles including dark energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 4, (2021) 043509, [arXiv:2011.11894 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
 - [43] T. Fujita, Y. Minami, K. Murai, and H. Nakatsuka, “Probing axionlike particles via cosmic microwave background polarization,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 6, (2021) 063508, [arXiv:2008.02473 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).